



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission
FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director
ADDRESS: 407 Collier Ridge
APPLICATION: CA2-20-343
MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021 deferred from January 27th and January 13th

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1945

Property Location: West of Dale Creek Drive and East of Baker Ridge Drive

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Exterior renovation

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work was places on the property 8/28/20 for painted brick and alterations that complying to the District Regulations.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility standard shall comply to the following review: "In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

DOCUMENTATION

The Applicant has not provided elevations for the exterior renovation. Staff recommends the Applicant provide plans with elevations. From the research, it appears the floor elevations does not match the photo prior to renovation which shows a front entry door centered to the house. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photos of the house before renovation, if they have them.

ALTERATIONS

The Applicants has performed a series of alterations that are not permitted in the District.

Front Entry

The Applicant has transformed the entire front of the house by moving the front stoop entry from the center position and flushing it to a left entry. This movement is a violation of the District regulation. Staff recommends the Applicant orient the entry to its original position so that the integrity of the house is not compromise.

Windows

The one photo Staff has does not show the windows very well to determine if windows have been altered. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photos of the windows so that Staff can clearly determine whether windows have been altered.

Porch

The Applicant has installed a small porch with a gable roof with railings and columns. The porch and stoop construction are based on the compatibility standard. From research the predominance of stoop to small porches with a gable roof are equal. Therefore, Staff is not concerned with the small porch with a gable roof, railing and columns. However, the railing is not installed correctly. They are installed as deck railings. Staff recommends railings be a two-part butt head construction. Staff also recommend the columns represent what is represent on the blockface.

Door

The Applicant has removed the historic decorative screen door that is significant to the house. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the decorative screen door if the door is still available. If the original decorative screen door is not available, the Applicant shall replace in-kind the door.

Awnings

The Applicant has removed the awnings which appear to have been original to the house and were integral to telling the story of the house. Staff recommends the Applicant retain the awnings, if the awnings are not available, the Applicant should replace in-kind.

Painted Masonry

The Applicant has painted unpainted masonry. This is a violation in the District. Staff recommends the Applicant remove the paint in a manner that is not abrasive to the brick. Sandblasting is permitted.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall provide exterior elevations for proposed renovation, Sec.16-20Q.001;
2. The Applicant shall orient the front entry to the original position, center to the house , per Sec.16-20Q.001;
3. The Applicant shall provide photos of the windows before renovation and after so that Staff can properly review, Sec.16-20Q.006(2);
4. The porch railings shall be a two-part head-butt construction and the railings shall represent what is on the blockface, Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(a);
5. The decorative screen door shall be retained if available. If not available, it shall be replaced in-kind, Sec.16-20Q.006(2)(a)
6. The awnings over the windows shall be retained if available, If not available, they shall be replaced in-kind, Sec.16-20Q.001(3)(a)
7. The paint shall be removed from the masonry in manner that will not damage the brick. Sand blasting is not permitted, Sec.16-20Q.001 and
8. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 979 Crescent Ave. Margaret Mitchell House/Windsor Apartments.

APPLICATION: CA2-21-020

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Landmark Building/Site **Other Zoning:** SPI-16 (Subarea 1)

Date of Construction: 1899

Property Location: Southeast corner of Crescent Ave. and 10th st.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing the repair and replacement of non-historic materials including window trim, balusters, woodwork, and columns. In their narrative, the Applicant states that the materials to be replaced are non-historic and date from a 1996 repair of the structure. In general Staff finds the work to be appropriate and is not concerned that the work would result in the loss of historic materials. As such, Staff has no major concerns with the project.

However, the materials do not give Staff enough information to understand the extent of the work. For instance, the scope of work notes the replacement of balusters and window trim, and photographs are provided showing examples of the area of concern, but no indication is given as to the amount of balusters proposed for replacement or the extent of window trim replacement proposed. As such, Staff would recommend that the Applicant clarify the specific areas of work and the extent of the work proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall clarify the specific areas of work and the extent of the work proposed.
2. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 711 Catherine St.

APPLICATION: CA3-21-006

MEETING DATE: January 27, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Adair Park Historic District

Other Zoning: C-2-C / Beltline.

Date of Construction: 1912 with additions in the 1930's

Property Location: Northeast corner of Catherine St. and Mayland Ave.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Institutional.

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Variance.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20I

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20I of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow an accessory structure on a corner lot which is not situated towards the interior and rear lot lines.

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography;

The Applicant cites the large lot size compared to the neighboring properties. Staff additionally finds that the required on-site parking spots are located in the area where a compliant accessory structure would be required to sit.

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship;

The Applicant states that requiring the corner lot specific accessory structure setbacks would prevent an otherwise conforming accessory structure from being built on the lot.

Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved;

The Applicant states that the subject property is the largest single property in the District. Staff would note that it is also the only commercial structure located in the interior residential blocks of the District.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that locating the accessory structure in the proposed location would allow for successful operation of the associated businesses and would provide a benefit to the neighborhood while keeping with the other building setbacks on the subject property.

In general Staff finds that the request meets the standards for granting a variance. Staff further finds that granting the requested variance would not impair the Commission's ability to enforce the Historic District zoning regulations in the future.

The Applicant has provided an updated site plan showing the accessory structure moved further back on the lot. As the location would still require a variance, Staff retains its support of the requested variance. However, upon further review of the project Staff finds that the design of the structure would benefit from a closer adherence to the surrounding residential architecture. While the architecture of accessory structures is normally not subject to review by either the Commission or Staff, the granting of a variance presents the opportunity to ensure the design of the project closer aligns to the historic character of the neighborhood via conditions of approval.

In general, Staff finds that the proposed structure has is utilitarian in appearance and uses materials that are not found on the subject block face. Further the design of the structure, while replicating the front facing gable roof form of many historic structures in the immediate area, could be further enhanced via the inclusion of features typically associated with those historic structures such as a porch area. As such, Staff recommends the proposed structure utilize materials based on the historic structures on the subject block face. Staff further recommends a front porch be added to the front of the structure matching the general scale of porches on the subject block face.

CA3-21-006 for 711 Catherine St.

January 27, 2021

Page 3 of 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1091 Tucker Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-21-025

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North block face of Tucker Ave., west of the Lee St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Vacant

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New construction of townhomes and site work

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: The Commission previously reviewed and approved CA3-19-439, CA3-19-440, and CA3-19-527. The current proposal is a departure from the previous projects and will require a rezoning to allow a change in conditions, specifically the new site plan.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Previous reviews and reviewable elements

The previous reviews on this site included two variances that based the non-quantitative comparisons on the north and south block faces of Lawton Ave., and set the maximum height range at 35' as opposed to being based on the height of the comparable property on Tucker Ave. While the design of the current proposal is a departure from the site planning and architecture of the previous proposal the two approved variances would still be in effect.

As with the previous review, the District regulation's architectural controls would only apply to the frontmost buildings on the site. The current proposal designates the frontmost buildings as building #1 and #2. Staff will direct their comments to these structures in their recommendations.

Many of the site plan specific requirements of the Historic District regulations will be replaced by the conditional site plan that will be adopted as part of the re-zoning request. As the site plan represents a coordinated review by Staff from the Office of Design, Office of Zoning and Development, and the Oakland City Community Organization, Staff has no concerns that the proposed site plan will unnecessarily limit the Commission's ability to review the architecture of the structures proposed. However, given the review limitations based on the conditional site plan, Staff will not comment on the site work or placement of the buildings.

Site Plan

The Applicant is proposing five multifamily buildings with space provided for two future buildings in the location of a proposed parking lot. In general, Staff has few concerns with the site plan proposed by the Applicant except for the massing of building #1 and #2. Staff finds that the massing of these two buildings is incompatible with the block face and the District at large. However, Staff finds that this could be resolved by splitting the massing of building #1 and #2 into four (4) buildings. As such, Staff recommends that buildings #1 and #2 be split into four buildings to allow the project to conform to the residential character of the District.

Architecture

The Applicant is proposing structures with alternating principal roof forms of front facing gables and shed roofs. However, the grouping proposed by the Applicant which includes two grouped gable roofs and two grouped shed roofs repeating in a pattern is not supported by the comparison analysis. Staff finds that the comparable block faces contain many New South Cottages and Queen Anne cottages which this project could easily emulate by alternating the gable and shed roof typologies. As such, Staff recommends buildings #1 and #2 alternate the gabled and shed roof forms.

In looking at the proposed elevations, Staff notes the use of both cement lap siding and cement paneling on the front façade. While Staff finds that the cement lap siding would be compatible with the horizontal lap siding on the comparable properties, Staff can find no historic cladding material to support the use of cement paneling on the front or side façades. As such, Staff recommends buildings #1 & #2 only use horizontal lap siding as a cladding material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. Buildings #1 and #2 shall be split into four buildings to allow the project to conform to the residential character of the District, per Sec. 16-20M.13(2)(g);
2. Buildings #1 and #2 shall alternate the gabled and shed roof forms, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(f);
3. Buildings #1 & #2 shall only use horizontal lap siding as a cladding material, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q); and,
4. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 2561 Loghaven

APPLICATION: CA3-21-026

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4

Date of Construction: 1950

Property Location: West of Hamilton E. Holmes and East of E. Simon Terrace

Contributing (Y/N)? Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Addition and Alterations

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: Interior work

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20Q.

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: Stop Work was placed on the property 10/20 for unpermitted work.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

COMPATIBILITY STANDARD

The Compatibility standard shall comply to the following review: “In general, the intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height, setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face."

DOCUMENTATION

With the proposal for the addition, the Applicant needed to provide a site plan so that Staff can determine if the addition is in the foot print of the lot. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a site plan with FAR and setback information.

ADDITION

The Applicant proposes to add a carport to the existing structure. This addition needs to comply to the compatibility standard set by the district, which states, ...” the element in question (i.e. roof form, architectural trim, façade material, window type and material, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face...” From research, there are possibly three comparable houses that have a carport, while the remaining contributing houses do not demonstrate a carport. Many have full attached garages/carport. Staff recommends the carport is not constructed as proposed but instead the Applicant is permitted to construct an enclosed garage/carport which would meet the compatibility standard. Or if a detached garage can be placed in the rear behind the house not to exceed the rear setback that can be permissible.

ALTERATIONS

Front porch

The Applicant propose to alter the existing front stoop to include a gable roof with columns over the stoop replacing the awning roofing which appears to be original. If the awning over the stoop is original, Staff recommends the awning be retained because it is a defining feature to the house. If the awning is not original, the stoop modification will be based off the compatibility standard. Research indicates, there is only one house on the blockface that has a gable roof and columns over the stoop. The remaining houses have awning or a flat roof. Staff recommends the Applicant either retain the awning or construct a flat roof.

Windows

The Applicant has not indicated any plans for windows alterations with the exception that the awning over the windows will be removed. As mention above the awnings appear to be original to the house. If they are, the Staff recommends the Applicant retain the awnings.

Deck

The Applicant proposes install a rear deck that doesn't exceed the rear or side setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.

1. The Applicant shall provide a site plan which shall include the FAR and setback information, Sec.16-20Q.001;
2. The current proposed carport shall not be constructed. To meet the compatibility standard, the Applicant shall either constructed an enclosed garage/carport or a detached garage that sits behind the house that does not exceed the rear setback, per Sec.16-20Q.006(11)(b);
3. The awning over the stoop shall be retained if it is original, Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(a);
4. If the awning is not original, the stoop shall be designed to meet the compatibility standard to what predominates on the blockface, Sec.16-20Q.006(10)(d);
5. The awnings over the windows shall be retained if original, Sec.16-20Q.001(5) and
6. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 3027 Mclendon Cir.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-033

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Collier Heights Historic District **Other Zoning:** MR-3

Date of Construction: 1958

Property Location: North block face of Mclendon Cir., west of the Woodmere Dr. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Yes.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Ranch

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rear addition

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20Q

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20Q of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant is proposing a rear addition to the existing structure. Per the District regulations, the rear yard setbacks of additions are based on the compatibility rule. No comparison analysis has been received for the rear yard setback range. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide the comparison analysis detailing the allowable rear yard setback range. Staff further recommends the rear yard setback meet the Compatibility rule.

The Applicant proposes to clad the structure in horizontal lap siding with a CMU block foundation. The District regulations base siding material on the compatibility rule. As the existing structure is contributing Staff finds it appropriate to require the materials to be compatible with the existing structure. As such, Staff recommends the entire right side façade of the addition, including the foundation, be clad in brick matching the size, dimensions, and color of the original brick on the structure. Staff further recommends that an expansion joint be used between the existing brick and the new brick on the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide the comparison analysis detailing the allowable rear yard setback range, per Sec. 16-20.005(1)(b);
2. The rear yard setback shall meet the Compatibility rule, per Sec. 16-20.005(1)(b);
3. The right entire side façade of the addition, including the foundation, shall be clad in brick matching the size, dimensions, and color of the original brick on the structure, per Sec. 16-20.006(1)(g);
4. An expansion joint shall be used between the existing brick and the new brick on the addition, per Sec. 16-20.005(1)(b)(ix); and,
5. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1151 Arlington Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-20-035

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Oakland City Historic District

Other Zoning: R-4A / Beltline

Date of Construction: Vacant

Property Location: North block face of Arlington Ave., west of the Peoples St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: n/a.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: infill

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: New Construction

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Comparison Analysis

The Applicant has provided an incomplete comparison analysis. Firstly, the Applicant has included structures that are not on the same block face as the subject property. Further, several measurements and comparisons which are required by the zoning ordinance have not been included. And lastly, the analysis does not include all of the historic structures on the block face. Due to the inaccuracies and lack of information provided, Staff finds that a complete review of the project will not be possible at this time. However, Staff will detail the specific issues with the comparison analysis in the following sections.

Staff recommends the Applicant submit a comparison analysis that only includes historic structures on the north block face of Arlington Ave, between the intersections of Oakland Dr. and Peebles St. Staff further notes that the block face contains several non-historic structures from which comparisons cannot be made. These properties all contain front facing gables and are predominately duplexes built in 2004 before the District was designated.

Development Controls

The Applicant has not provided measurements for the front and side yard setbacks per the District regulations. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide comparison information for the allowable front and side yard setbacks.

Architectural Standards

Per the District regulations, the height of a new structure is based on the compatibility rule. Given the issues with the comparison analysis, Staff finds that there is not enough information at this time to review the proposed height of the structure. Staff recommends the Applicant include the measurements of all historic structures on the subject block face.

Per the District regulations, the first floor elevation above grade is subject to the compatibility rule. Staff recommends the Applicant provide comparison information for the first floor elevation height.

Due to the issues with the comparison analysis, a review of the proposed roof pitch is not possible at this time. However, a visual analysis of the historic properties shows the predominate historic roof forms to be shallow pitched side gabled roofs. As such, Staff recommends the roof form be changed to meet the form of the comparable properties on the block face.

The District regulations require the design and size of front porches to be based on the compatibility rule. Staff finds that none of the comparable properties on the block face contain a full width front porch. Staff further finds that only front stoops appear on the block face. As such, Staff recommends the front porch be changed to a front stoop matching the design of historic front stoops on the block face.

The District regulations require the massing of the structure to be based on the compatibility rule. Staff recommends the Applicant provide comparison analysis for the proposed building width.

Per the District regulations, the fenestration on the side facades is subject to the compatibility rule. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide compatibility information for the proposed fenestration on the side façades.

Window and door casing and width is also based on the compatibility rule. As no information has been provided for this element, Staff recommends the Applicant provide comparison information for the proposed window and door casing width and depths.

Staff recommends the proposed cement siding be smooth faced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit a comparison analysis that only includes historic structures on the north block face of Arlington Ave, between the intersections of Oakland Dr. and Peeples St., per Sec. 16-20M.005;
2. The Applicant shall provide comparison information for the allowable front and side yard setbacks, per Sec. 16-20M.012;
3. The Applicant shall include the height measurements for all historic structures on the subject block face in their comparison analysis, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(g);
4. The Applicant shall provide comparison information for the first floor elevation height, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(h);
5. The roof form shall be changed to meet the form of the comparable properties on the block face, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(f);
6. The front porch shall be changed to a front stoop matching the design of historic front stoops on the block face, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(i);
7. The Applicant shall provide comparison analysis for the proposed building width, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(g);
8. The Applicant shall provide compatibility information for the proposed fenestration on the side façades, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(n);
9. The Applicant shall provide comparison information for the proposed window and door casing width and depths, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(o);
10. The proposed cement siding shall be smooth faced, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(q); and,
11. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 1585 South Ponce De Leon Ave.

APPLICATION: CA3-21-037 & 036

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: Druid Hills Landmark District

Other Zoning: N/A

Date of Construction:

Property Location: South block face of South Ponce De Leon Ave. west of the Clifton Rd. intersection.
Property also has frontage along the north block face of Clifton Ter. west of the Page Ave. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Original house, known as “Pinebloom” is contributing. Church building/addition is noncontributing. Accessory structure is contributing.

Building Type / Architectural form/style: Tudor Revival

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Alterations, new construction of accessory structures, and site work.

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues:

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-21-037: Deferral.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-21-036: Deferral.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Variance Request

The requested variance is to allow a reduction in the Clifton Ter. front yard setback from 168' (required) to 100' (proposed).

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography;

The Applicant cites the double frontage nature of the lot.

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship;

The Applicant states that requiring the secondary frontage to conform to the same frontage as the principal frontage would severely restrict development on the lot. The Applicant also identifies an existing accessory structure which is set 100' from the Clifton Ter. frontage.

Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved;

The Applicant states that this structure is one of two double frontage lots in the District with frontage along Clifton Ter. The Applicant also cites the existing accessory structure set back 100' from Clifton Ter. as evidence of a 100' rear yard setback on the property originally.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that the properties near the Clifton Ter. frontage as being outside of the Landmark District zoning as well as the relatively narrow front yard setbacks of these properties as evidence that a 68' reduction in the required Clifton Ter. front yard would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the intent of the Landmark District regulations or the Commission's ability to enforce them on other properties.

In general, Staff finds that the request responds to the variance criteria, but given its recommendation regarding CA3-21-036 and that the variance and overall design composition are closely linked, it would recommend deferral of CA3-21-037.

Application of the Landmark District regulations

As stated in the findings of fact, the existing site includes the historic home known as "Pinebloom," a non-historic church building, a non-historic church addition, and a historic accessory structure. The review process for these structures will be different according to their historic importance to the site. For alterations to the historic home and carriage house, the District regulations require reviews by the Atlanta Urban Design Commission. However, for alterations to the non-historic church building and additions, including their demolition, no review is required. As such, Staff will not comment on the demolition of the non-historic church building and the non-historic church addition in their review unless the work would impact the historic principal or accessory structure on the site.

General Development Controls

From a purely quantitative perspective, the number of multifamily units that are permitted on the property is a function of the property size such that for each dwelling unit provided there is at least 3,600 sf of lot area. The proposed eighteen (18) dwelling units meets the quantitative District regulation as there is at least 64,800 sq. ft. of property area. The number of multifamily units is further defined by a minimum square footage for each unit provided in an existing building. As part of the proposal, the Applicant is seeking to convert the historic principal structure on the property into 4 dwelling units. The District regulations require at least 750 sf for each new unit created in an existing structure. The Applicant's floor area calculations show square footage of 6,090 sf associated with these new units. To confirm the requirement that each new dwelling unit in the principal structure contains at least 750 sf, Staff would recommend the Applicant clarify on the site plan the square footage of each new dwelling unit proposed in the historic principal structure.

Regarding the lot coverage, the District regulations refer to the Land Use Intensity (LUI) Table of the Residential General zoning district (RG) which doesn't calculate lot coverage per se but does have total and usable open space requirements which do define lot coverage differently by requiring minimum amounts of open space (total and usable). Further, the floor area ratio (FAR) that would be applied to the chart is not prescribed by the District regulations but rather calculated based on the number of units and the size of the units allowed by the District regulations concerning the net lot area.

The LUI Table requires that all calculations related to it be done using the gross lot area. To calculate the effective FAR, the total residential square footage proposed (both in the new buildings and the existing, retained buildings) would be divided by the gross lot area (181,556 sq. ft.), resulting in an effective FAR of .294. The closest FAR listed in the LUI Table is .214, resulting in a required open space of .76 of the gross lot area and the usable open space of .51 of the gross lot area. While the site plan lists different minimum percentages for both the total open space and the usable open space, Staff finds that the requirements have been met or exceeded.

The District regulations also use the RG zoning district regulations to calculate the distance between the buildings. The submission includes a summary of these calculations, but it is not clear to the Staff how these calculations were arrived at. The Staff would recommend the Applicant document compliance with the building separation calculations.

The proposal includes fifty-six (56) on-site parking spaces where twenty-nine (29) are required from a quantitative perspective. The design and location of the parking is discussed in "Site Elements."

The District regulations restrict building on slopes of greater than 25% for houses and no greater than 15% for other structures. No indication as to whether the current proposal meets this requirement has been given. The District regulations also prohibit development in the 100-year floodplain. No indication is given as to whether the subject property lies within a 100-year floodplain. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant document that none of the buildings violate the minimum drainage controls.

Site Elements

The Applicant is proposing two new parking locations between the principal structure and South Ponce De Leon Ave. These parking areas appear to be replacing parking that is lost in the

reconfiguration of the existing driveway. In general, Staff finds that the location of the proposed parking would detract from both the historic site features and would not reinforce the character of either the site or the District in general. As such, Staff recommends the parking lots on the north half of the property be removed and replaced with parallel parking along the driveway on the northwest / west portion of the site where head-in parking currently exists along the side of the church addition.

The portion of hardscape between the historic principal structure and the site which connected the historic home to the non-contributing church appears to be retained in the proposed site plan. Staff finds that the removal of this hardscape could greatly increase the degree that the site conforms to the historic lot conditions. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant explain the need for retaining the existing hardscape.

A pool is proposed to the rear of the historic home. Generally, the area associated with the pool and the pool deck is roughly similar to the footprint of the historic home on the site. Staff finds that the footprint of the pool and pool deck is incompatible with the overall site composition and the relative sizes of the existing and proposed buildings. Further, Staff finds that reducing the deck surrounding the pool and moving the pool further north on the site would free additional site space that could be used to better reconfigure the placement of villas 4 and 5. Staff recommends the pool hardscape and relocated pool be reduced in size and repositioned on the site to increase the overall compatibility of the project with the District.

Regarding villas 4 and 5, Staff finds that their relocation towards the east and interior of the lot, which could be accommodated via reducing the hardscape around the pool and moving the pool towards the north, could result in the reduction of overall tree loss while also maintaining the traditional yard distance typified by historic principal and accessory structures. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant consider alternate locations for villas 4 and 5 which would protect existing trees and replicate traditional yard distances.

The site plan shows several pedestrian walk areas that end abruptly where driveways begin. Staff finds that pedestrian travel should be prioritized on the site and continue across drives. Additionally, pedestrian connections to Clifton Ter., including connections from the front of cottages 1 & 2, should be included as part of the proposal. As such, Staff recommends the pedestrian infrastructure be prioritized and expanded as part of this proposal. Staff further recommends that pedestrian access to Clifton Ter. be provided.

At the southern end of the property between cottage #1 & #2, staff finds that the turn radii provided are excessive. This condition, along with a straight primary drive, creates a pavement “tunnel vista” effect that is incompatible with the historic character of both the property and the District. Staff recommends the turning radii between cottages #1 & #2 be reduced. Staff further recommends the straight driveway leading from Clifton Ter. be reconfigured to include a curved layout to reduce the visual impact of the pavement on the site. Staff is also concerned about the overall width and treatment of the driveways on the site. While it understands there are minimums related to fire truck access and maneuverability, reducing the driveways to their absolute minimum widths (and/or using materials to “visually” reduce their practical impact on the site composition would increase the overall compatibility of the project with the District.

Along the north and south driveways, access gates are proposed. The District regulations prohibit fences, including gates, between principal structures and the street. On the southern end of the property, this would also include any gate between villa #4 and Clifton Ter. Staff recommends the access gates be moved to compliant locations.

In general, the materials of the proposed paving and walk areas have not been noted. Staff recommends the Applicant detail the materials for the proposed paving and walk areas, to include a response to the driveway “width” concerns noted above.

The District regulations require that each tree that is removed be replaced even if recompense is otherwise being sued to comply with the City’s general Tree Ordinance. Staff has not received a tree survey or a tree replacement plan as part of this proposal. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide a tree survey and tree replacement plan.

The project will be required to conform to stormwater and drainage requirements. While those requirements are not necessarily subject to a review by the Commission, Staff finds that their proper implementation has the potential to affect the design of the proposal which is a concern of the Commission. As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information relating to the stormwater and drainage requirements and how they will be met by the proposal.

Architectural Elements

While Staff understands the current stage of the design process for the project, the information received by Staff is lacking regarding the architectural elements of the new structures and the alterations to the existing structure.

There will be considerable demolition work to the non-contributing church building addition where it is attached to the existing principal structure. No information is provided about the approach to this demolition and/or the resulting restoration work on the house were the church addition connected. Further, Staff assumes that there will exterior renovations of some kind to the existing principal structure. No information is provided about this work either. Therefore, Staff recommends that existing and proposed elevations be provided for the demolition work in general, the demolition interface between the church addition and principal house specifically, and any general alterations to the principal structure.

Regarding the design of the new dwelling units on the site, the Applicant has only provided partial elevations. The District regulations require the new structures to be both secondary and subordinate to the principal structure, which Staff would interpret to be a simplified Tudor Revival style on structures that are both shorter in height and less massive than the principal structure. To review the proposed structures, Staff will need complete elevations of them. Additionally, the relationship between proposed villa #1 and the historic principal structure will have a significant impact on the overall character of the property given their proximity to each other and their prominence on the site. Because of this, Staff finds that a study comparing in context the proposed villa #1 and the historic principal structure is also required.

As such, Staff recommends the Applicant provide complete elevations for the proposed dwellings and a study comparing the new dwellings to the principal structure. Staff further recommends the Applicant provide elevations of the proposed parking structure. Lastly, Staff recommends the Applicant provide information on the proposed materials that will be used in the new dwellings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONCA3-20-037: Deferral.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONCA3-20-036: Deferral to allow the applicant time to address the following concerns:

1. To confirm the requirement that each new dwelling unit in the principal structure contains at least 750 sf, the Applicant shall clarify on the site plan the square footage of each new dwelling unit proposed in the historic principal structure, per Sec. 16-20B.004(1)(a0;
2. The Applicant shall document compliance with the building separation calculations, per Sec. 16-20B.004(5)(b);
3. The Applicant shall document that none of the buildings violate the minimum drainage controls, per Sec. 16-20B.003(5);
4. The parking lots on the north half of the property shall be removed and replaced with parallel parking along the driveway on the northwest portion of the site, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
5. The Applicant shall explain the need for retaining the existing hardscape, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
6. The Applicant shall explore the effect that a reduced pool hardscape and relocated pool would have on the site plan as a whole, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
7. the Applicant consider alternate locations for villas 4 and 5 which would protect existing trees and replicate traditional yard distances, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
8. The Applicant shall explore ways that pedestrian infrastructure can be prioritized as part of this proposal, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
9. Pedestrian access to Clifton Ter. shall be provided, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
10. The Applicant shall explore options to reduce the turning radii between cottages #1 & #2, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
11. The straight driveway leading from Clifton Ter. shall be reconfigured to include a curved layout to reduce the visual impact of the pavement on the site, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
12. The access gates shall be moved to compliant locations, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(7)(a);
13. The Applicant shall detail the materials for the proposed paving and walk areas, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4);
14. The Applicant shall provide a tree survey and tree replacement plan, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(4)(i);
15. The Applicant shall provide information relating to the stormwater and drainage requirements and how they will be met by the proposal;
16. Existing and proposed elevations for the demolition and required alterations to the principal structure shall be provided, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(6);
17. The Applicant shall provide complete elevations for the proposed dwellings and a study comparing the new dwellings to the principal structure, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(6);
18. The Applicant shall provide elevations of the proposed parking structure, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(6);
19. The Applicant shall provide information on the proposed materials that will be used in the new dwellings, Per Sec. 16-20B.003(6); and,
20. All updated plans and documents shall be submitted no less than 8 days before the deferred meeting date.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood

CA3-21-037 & 036 for 1585 South Ponce De Leon Ave.

February 10, 2021

Page 7 of 7

File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 283 Elm Street

APPLICATION: RC-20-390

MEETING DATE: February 10th deferred from January 20th and January 13, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** N/A

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: Historic Vine City

Contributing (Y/N)? N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** City of Atlanta Statue

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Statue

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A

Relevant Code Sections: N/A

Deferred Application (Y/N)? No

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Chapter 20 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

The Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs Office proposes to accept a gift of a statue of Congressman John Lewis. This statue will sit on public property owned by the City. "As part of this agreement the City requires a guarantee of maintenance, preservation, and conservation in perpetuity from the donor—unless the commissioning City agency responsible for siting a potential gift agrees to fund the performance of these duties. The Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs Public Art Program (OCA/PAP) is the agency responsible for public art stewardship in Atlanta." Besides the requirement set above, a questionnaire is required to be answered by the donor or donating organization; in this case, the donor is National Monument Foundation.

The statue of Congressman Lewis will be in the Rodney Cook Park in Historic Vine City. The Artist is Gregory Johnson. The statue is 92 inches H x 58 inches W x 38 inches D, weighing 800 pounds. The base is 68 inches H x 52 inches W x 43 inches D with a weight of 13,600 pounds. The material for the statue is bronze and the pedestal is made of polished Italian granite.

Mr. Cook was a friend of Congressman Lewis. Upon learning of Congressman Lewis health issues, Mr. Cook set forth to create this statue if the Congressman continued to fight. Before his passing, Congressman Lewis was shown the statue and was really pleased with it.

As stated in the Application, Congressman Lewis had a life of accomplishments that benefited the entire city and country. His inspiration can not be summed up in a few words and we can't repay him for all he has done. This statue is just a small gesture to show what he meant to the world. To have a stature of Congressman in Atlanta in a community where he fought for the rights of the disenfranchised, would be an honor. Staff not only do not see any problems with this proposal, Staff encourages the City to take advantage of it. Staff does recommend adequate lighting be installed to not only illuminate the statute but also allow for safety around the stature. Staff also suggest amped walkable paths be applied so that the community and have access to the stature.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 90 Peachtree St.

APPLICATION: RC-21-039

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: N/A **Other Zoning:** Various

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: North and south block faces of Peachtree Pl. between the Crescent Ave. and Peachtree St. Intersections.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Vacant

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: work in the Public ROW

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes a series of changes to the existing right of way of Peachtree Pl. between Crescent Ave. and Peachtree St. Of note is the reduction of area dedicated to vehicular traffic, pedestrian enhancements, and a public art installation over the pedestrian enhancements on the north block face of the project area.

The existing pedestrian spaces at the corner of Peachtree Place and Peachtree St. include a bulb-out at the crosswalk. The Applicant proposes increasing the bulb out footprint towards the west on both the north and south block faces. The existing median would also be reconfigured into a simplified design. The enhancements would result in the elimination of nine (9) on-street parking spaces, and would require the removal of eight (9) street trees with twelve (12) new street trees. Several other material enhancements appear to be planned for the northeast and southeast corners of Peachtree St. and Peachtree Pl., that would not result in major changes to the site geometry.

In general Staff finds that the proposed improvements would result in a more comfortable pedestrian experience and would encourage the use of transit or walking to access the surrounding businesses and residences. Staff would suggest that the Applicant detail the maintenance and care program that will be implemented for the new street trees including identifying the party that will be responsible for their care.

On the north block face of the project area, a new art installation be suspended over the pedestrian improvements via a catenary cable system. In general, Staff has few concerns with the installation of public art but does note that the plans include a note that the art shown in the elevations is for reference only. Staff suggests the Applicant clarify whether the art in the elevations is a placeholder graphic or whether the elevations show the design intent of the artist. Staff further suggests that the Applicant detail the materials of the proposed art and note whether the selected material will require ongoing maintenance. If so, Staff suggests the Applicant detail their plans for the maintenance of the art installation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

cc: Applicant
File



CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491
www.atlantaga.gov

TIM KEANE
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP
Director, Office of Design

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlanta Urban Design Commission

FROM: Doug Young, Executive Director

ADDRESS: 846 White St.

APPLICATION: RC-21-046

MEETING DATE: February 10, 2021

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Historic Zoning: West End Historic District **Other Zoning:**

Date of Construction: N/A

Property Location: South block face of White St., east of the Lee St. intersection.

Contributing (Y/N)?: Vacant

Building Type / Architectural form/style: N/A

Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission: Rezoning

Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission: N/A.

Relevant Code Sections: Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20G

Deferred Application (Y/N)?: No.

Previous Applications/Known Issues: N/A

SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION: Send a letter with comments to the Secretary of the Zoning Review Board.

CONCLUSIONS: The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The proposal before the Commission is the rezoning of five (5) lots from R-4A to PD-H to allow the consolidation of the lots and the construction of up to nine (9) dwellings on the site. Staff from the Office of Design, The Office of Zoning and Development, the Applicant, and the West End Neighborhood group have worked together to draft zoning conditions that would be tied to the rezoning and would ensure that future development on the site conforms to the intent of the Historic District regulations and preserves the Commission's ability to apply the regulations to the new structures along White St. while also allowing for design flexibility for the remaining structures on the site.

The setbacks and bulk limitations would be determined by the PD-H zoning. At the time of the writing of this Staff Report, Staff anticipates the zoning to be conditioned on a site plan dated 01/14/2021. The remaining aspects of the project would be governed by the zoning conditions, a draft of which have been provided in the Commission's materials. Of the proposed conditions, the ones which would most directly relate to the Commission's role in the review of the projects and the application of the Historic District regulations are as follows:

3. Consistent with Section 16-20G.006(12) of the West End Historic District Regulations, White Street streetscapes shall be as follows:
 - a. Sidewalks shall be installed consisting of a 7 feet wide walk zone and a 3 feet wide landscape amenity zone;
 - b. Street trees shall be located in the amenity zone a maximum distance of 30 feet on-center and shall be limited to one species approved for planting in the public right-of-way;
 - c. Walk zone materials shall be brick arranged in a herringbone pattern matching the historic herringbone brick sidewalks on the block face;
 - d. All existing depressed granite curbing and buried historic sidewalk bricks shall be reused in the streetscape installation, subject to approval of the Atlanta Department of Transportation and the Office of Design Historic Preservation Division; and
 - e. Any new sidewalk brick used shall match the buried historic sidewalk bricks in terms of size, color, and texture, subject to approval of the Atlanta Department of Transportation and the Office of Design Historic Preservation Division.
4. The height, lot placement, and design of buildings 1 & 2 shown on the master site plan and any accessory structures accessory to them shall conform to the procedures and requirements of Section 16-20G West End Historic District Regulations except as follows:
 - a. The side yard setbacks of the structures which front the private drive shall be as shown on the master site plan;
 - b. Dormers of sufficient size and pitch to allow second floor space shall be allowed only on the side and rear roof planes; and,
 - c. The Developer shall submit a compatibility study demonstrating conformance with this condition #4 utilizing the nine contributing historic houses along the south side of White Street between Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Lee Street within the West End Historic District.
5. The height lot placement and design of buildings 3, 4a, 4b, 5, 6a, 6b, and 7 shown on the master site plan and all associated accessory structures shall conform to the following:

- a. New building, new accessory structures, and modifications to existing buildings and accessory structures shall require a Type II Staff Review Certificate of Appropriateness, which shall be reviewed using the standards for accessory structures set forth in Section 16-20G West End Historic District Regulations, except as noted in 5b through 5e below;
- b. A copy of each Type II Staff Review Certificate of Appropriateness required by “a” immediately above shall be transmitted by the applicant to the WEND Preservation and Urban Design Committee chair(s) for review and comment on or before its filing. Each Type II Staff Review Certificate of Appropriateness application shall not be approved by the Office of Design Historic Preservation Division for 30 calendar days from filing, or until the Office of Design Historic Preservation Division has received written comments from said Committee chair(s), whichever occurs first;
- c. Buildings shall not extend higher than the highest roofline of buildings 1 & 2, excluding chimneys, cupolas or similar structures otherwise excluded from building height; and,
- d. Building façades that face the private drive shall meet the same design standards required for buildings 1 & 2 by condition #4 above except that building 7 may have a carport facing the private drive; and
- e. Accessory structures including, but not limited to, walkways, driveways, parking pads, and fences shall conform to the materials required by condition #4 above.

The zoning conditions would require buildings number 1 & 2 and any future accessory buildings to be reviewed by the Commission via the processes prescribed by the West End Historic District zoning regulations. The remaining structures on the site would be reviewed via Type II *Staff Review* applications which would be reviewed on an extended timeline to allow the neighborhood a chance to review the proposals. The regulations for the remaining structures would be based on the requirements for accessory structures with a few exceptions. Staff finds that the conditions are appropriate and supports the rezoning as proposed.

While not in the current rezoning proposal, Staff would note for the benefit of both the Commission and the Zoning Review Board that they do not support any zoning condition that would introduce a requirement that the project conform to a set of architectural elevations, sketches, or designs. The inclusion of such documents as a zoning condition would inhibit the Commission’s ability to enforce and interpret the West End Historic District regulations as prescribed by Chapter 20 of the Zoning ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

cc: Applicant
Neighborhood
File